1	Chief Trial Deputy ELIZABETH L. DEELEY, State Bar #230798 Deputy City Attorney		
2			
3			
4			
5	1390 Market Street, 6 th Floor San Francisco, California 94102-5408 Telephone: (415) 554-3982		
6	Facsimile: (413) 534-3982		
7	E-Mail: elizabeth.deeley@sfgov.org		
8	Attorneys for Defendant		
9	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,		
10			
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
12	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
13	DENNIS ROZADILLA,	Case No. c04-0909 MEJ	
14	Plaintiff,	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO CHANGE TIME FOR	
15	VS.	EXPERT DISCLOSURES AND EXPERT DISCOVERY CUTOFF	
16	SHERIFF MICHAEL HENNESSEY, et al.,	U.S.D.C. Northern District	
17		L.R. 6-3	
18	Defendants.		
19		Date Action Filed: July 9, 2004 Trial Date: July 17, 2007	
20			
21	On December 18, 2006, the Court granted the parties' first request to change the deadlines fo		
22	discovery and dispositive motions. The Court's order set a January 31, 2007 deadline for expert		
23	disclosures, February 15, 2007 deadline for rebuttal expert disclosures and March 9 as the cutoff for		
24	all discovery, including experts.		
25	The parties, through their undersigned counsel, hereby stipulate to and respectfully request		
26	that the Court change the times for expert disclosures from January 31, 2007 to March 15, 2007 and		
27	rebuttal expert disclosures from February 15, 2007 to March 30, 2007. Currently the cut off for all		
28		W. W	

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO CHANGE TIME

Rozadilla v. Hennessey, No. C04-0909 MEJ

discovery is March 9, 2007. The parties also stipulate to and request that the Court set the date for the cutoff of discovery as it pertains to experts only for April 20, 2007. These changes should not effect the trial date.

The parties request these changes for the following reasons. First, through the course of discovery, the parties discovered that there are several medical providers for plaintiff whose records have not been produced. Plaintiff does not have those records, so defendant City and County of San Francisco ("defendant") issued third party subpoenas to obtain them. While defendant expected to receive documents in response to those subpoenas by the third week in January, many of the medical providers subpoenaed have not yet produced the requested documents. The parties anticipate that their experts will rely on these additional medical records. Thus, the parties require additional time to obtain these records before completing expert disclosures.

Second, the parties seeks to change the date for expert disclosures so that defendant may obtain an independent psychological examination ("IPE") of plaintiff. Plaintiff has placed his psychological condition in controversy and, thus, defendant requested last November that plaintiff stipulate to an IPE. Plaintiff's counsel agreed to discuss such a stipulation with plaintiff, or alternatively seek an order dismissing claims and requests for damages based on plaintiff's psychological condition. However, in the meantime, Plaintiff's counsel learned, and notified defendant's counsel, that plaintiff was unavailable to answer defendant's interrogatory requests or to discuss his claims based on his psychological condition because plaintiff's partner was gravely ill, and plaintiff was completely consumed with caring for her. Based on assurances from plaintiff's counsel that plaintiff intended to respond to defendant's discovery requests and to either stipulate to an IPE or seek an order dismissing his claims based on his psychological condition (and as a courtesy to plaintiff who was apparently dealing with an illness of a loved one), defendant's counsel did not at that time seek an order to compel an IPE or discovery responses. Defendant's counsel learned today that plaintiff has just become available and intends to address these issues sometime next week. In the meantime, however, the parties seek to change the time for expert disclosures, currently set for

1 January 31, 2007, for this additional reason that defendant seeks to have an IPE on plaintiff prior to 2 providing such disclosures. 3 For these reasons, the parties respectfully requests that the Court change the current 4 scheduling order to reflect the following changes: 5 Change the expert disclosure deadline from January 31, 2007 to March 15, 2007 Change rebuttal expert disclosures from February 15, 2007 to March 30, 2007 6 7 Change expert discovery cutoff from March 9, 2007 to April 20, 2007. 8 9 SO STIPULATED 10 Dated: January 25, 2007 11 DENNIS J. HERRERA City Attorney 12 JOANNE HOEPER Chief Trial Deputy 13 ELIZABETH L. ĎEELEY Deputy City Attorney 14 By: <u>/s/</u> 15 ELIZABETH L. DEELEY 16 Attorneys for Defendant 17 CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO 18 Dated: January 25, 2007 THE LAW OFFICE OF DENNIS CUNNINGHAM 19 By: /s/ 20 **DENNIS CUNNINGHAM** 21 Attorney for Plaintiff **DENNIS ROZADILLA** 22 23 PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED 24 GRANTED 25 Dated: January 29, 2007 26 Judge Maria Elena James HONOR 27 United § 28 3006/041145\00004973.doc STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO 3 CHANGE TIME Rozadilla v. Hennessey, No. C04-0909 MEJ